

11-14-03  
JK

**SERIAL NO. 10/095,489**Amendment dated November 6, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of August 7, 2003**PATENT**  
**Docket RAL920000057US1**Certificate of Mailing/Facsimile 37 CFR §1.8(a)  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

872-9314

 deposited with the United States Postal  
Service as first class mail in an envelope with  
sufficient postage addressed to the: facsimile transmitted to (703)695-9051 to  
thc: *AFS*Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 6, 2003*Amirah Scarborough*  
Person mailing documentSignature  
*Amirah Scarborough***RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER****In the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

NOV 06 2003

**Date:** November 6, 2003**In re Application of:** W.G. Holland, et al**Filed:** April 18, 2000**For:** Computer System and Method with Internal Use of  
Network Switching**Serial Number:** 09/551,790**Art Unit:** 2608**Examiner:** John A. Lane**RESPONSE**Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of August 7, 2003 presenting a restriction requirement, please note a provisional election of the claims of Group 1 for prosecution at this time.

**SERIAL NO. 10/095,489****Amendment dated November 6, 2003**  
**Reply to Office Action of August 7, 2003****PATENT**  
**Docket RAL920000057US1**

It is respectfully submitted that the restriction requirement is in error and the requirement is hereby traversed. The claims of Group 1, Claims 1 through 4, are apparatus claims directed to a computer system. The claims of Group 2, Claims 5 and 6, are method claims directed to the operation of a computer system as claimed in Claims 1 through 4. The inventions of the grouped claims are viewed by the Examiner as subcombinations useable together in a single combination. It is submitted that the claims are to an apparatus combination and to the operation of that apparatus combination. The Examiner has deemed the subject matter of the claims to be independent if it can be shown that four relationships are present, referring to MPEP 806.04 and 808.01. The Examiner asserts that the combinations as claimed exhibit conditions of having differing modes of operation, different functions, and different effects. It is submitted that these assertions reflect an incomplete understanding of the claimed inventions, which are related in such a manner that all claims should be examined together.

Reconsideration of this application and allowance of the claims presented is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel E. McConnell  
Atty. Reg. No. 20,360  
Attorney of Record

Customer No. 25299  
Phone: 919-543-1105  
FAX: 919-254-2649